

Attachment to Independent Case Review Report
For CDRU # 5403 Case file # 95-HQ-1052305.

Material Examiner: Malone (RO)

Remarks:

Case resulted in trial, transcript not provided.

CRM 488

INDEPENDENT CASE REVIEW REPORT

Independent Review conducted by: Steve Robertson

Area(s) of Expertise: Hair and Fibers

Review commenced at: 2:45 PM (Time), 11/07/01 (Date)

File #: 95A-HQ-1052305

Laboratory #(s): 30609015

30614009

Examiner(s) & Symbols

	Reviewed	Not Reviewed		Reviewed	Not Reviewed
RQ	X <input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
YD	<input type="checkbox"/>	X <input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Materials Reviewed

Trial testimony transcript(s) of: not provided

Testimony Date(s): _____ Pages: _____

Laboratory Report(s):

Laboratory Number: 30609015, 30614009 Date: Dec 14, 1993

Laboratory Number: _____ Date: _____

Laboratory Number: _____ Date: _____

Examiner Bench Notes of: RQ and unknown technician

Laboratory Number: 30609015

30614009

Page 1 of 3

Initials: SR

CRIM 468 A

Was any other material reviewed? ☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please identify and/or describe the material: submitting agency letters dated 6-6-93 and 6-8-93

Results of Review

File #: 95A-HQ-1052305

Item or Specimen # Reviewed: Q1-Q6, Q8-Q13, K3, K4, K6, K7

Review of Laboratory Report(s) and Bench Notes:

Note: Numbered comments are required below or on additional pages for any "No" or "Unable to Determine" Responses

- 1) Did the examiner perform the appropriate tests in a scientifically acceptable manner, based on the methods, protocols, and analytic techniques available at the time of the original examination(s)?
☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ Unable to Determine
- 2) Are the examination results set forth in the laboratory report(s) supported and adequately documented in the bench notes?
☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Unable to Determine

Review of Testimony:

Note: Numbered comments are required below or on additional pages for any "No" or "Unable to Determine" Responses

☒ Transcript not available.

- 3) Testimony consistent with the laboratory report(s)? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unable to Determine
- 4) Testimony consistent with the bench notes? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unable to Determine
- 5) Testimony within bounds of examiner's expertise? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unable to Determine

Page 2 of 3

Initials: SDM

Comments

(Set forth by above question #, if applicable.
Use "Additional Comments" Sheet, if needed)

File #: 95A-HQ-1052305

#1: With microscopic hair comparison, one cannot determine from the notes that the examination was conducted in an appropriate manner.

#2: Documentation is poor. The notes are not dated or initialed and are in pencil instead of ink. Abbreviations are used that are not readily interpreted. Some of the hairs recovered from Q items are marked as "NSFC".

Presumably, this means "Not Suitable for Comparison", but there is no documentation as to what makes these hairs unsuitable.

#2: Apparently, confirmation of the hair match was made by a second qualified (?) hair examiner.

Review completed at: 3:15 PM (Time), 11/07/01 (Date)

Total time spent conducting review (to nearest 1/4 hour): 0.50 hr

I hereby certify that I conducted this review in an independent, unbiased manner and that the results of my review are fully documented on this report consisting of a total of 3 pages.

Steve Roberts
(Signature)

11/07/2001

(Date)

Page 3 of 3

Initials: SW